

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/759,703 01/12/2001 David Lee Benson P04847US0 PHI 1379 2741 11/06/2003 27142 7590 **EXAMINER** MCKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C. MEHTA, ASHWIN D ATTN: PIONEER HI-BRED ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 801 GRAND AVENUE, SUITE 3200 DES MOINES, IA 50309-2721 1638

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/759,703	BENSON, DAVID LEE
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ashwin Mehta	1638
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ars on the cover sheet with the	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 02 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avairal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a name application in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
ee have been filed in the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officially filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply one ce later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);		
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1-7,51,52 and 54</u> .		
Claim(s) objected to: <u>20 and 50</u> .		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>8,42-49,53 and 55-63</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disappi	roved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	A A Aral
		ACLUSION DO NOTE TO THE
		ASHWIN D. MEHTA, PHLD PATENT EXAMINER

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 04-01) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: On page 8, 4th full paragraph of the response, Applicant states, "Applicant acknowledges the addition of new claims 64 through 91 as specifically stated by the claims faxed by ExamIner David Fox on November 15, 2002 and the new sample claim submitted by Supervisory Patent Examiner Amy Nelson via e-mail on August 7, 2003 and revised via telephone on August 25, 2003." However, the new claims were not faxed to Applicant by Examiner Fox, nor did he indicate to Applicant that the new claims were deemed acceptable for the instant application. Further, neither SPE Nelson nor Examiner Fox indicated in any communication that the "new sample claims" were acceptable for the instant case, in which the invention centers on a hybrid maize seed.